

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

MARIUS B. ROBINSON, Editor.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

ANN PEARSON, Publishing Agent.

VOL. 9.—NO. 27.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1854.

WHOLE NO. 437.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT SALEM, OHIO.

TERMS—\$1.00 per annum, payable in advance.

We occasionally send numbers to those who are not subscribers, but who are believed to be interested in the dissemination of anti-slavery truth with the hope that they will either subscribe themselves, or use their influence to extend its circulation among their friends.

Communications intended for insertion, to be addressed to

Marius B. Robinson, Editor. All others to ANN Pearson, Publishing Agent.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

One square 16 lines \$1.00; three weeks.

Each additional insertion, 25 cents.

Two squares \$1.00.

One year, 6.00.

Two squares six months, 5.00.

One year, 8.00.

One column, one year, with privilege of changing monthly, 12.00.

Half column, changing monthly, 10.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 20.00.

Half column, changing monthly, 18.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 25.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 28.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 30.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 32.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 34.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 36.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 38.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 40.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 42.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 44.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 46.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 48.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 50.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 52.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 54.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 56.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 58.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 60.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 62.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 64.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 66.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 68.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 70.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 72.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 74.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 76.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 78.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 80.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 82.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 84.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 86.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 88.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 90.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 92.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 94.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 96.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 98.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 100.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 102.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 104.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 106.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 108.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 110.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 112.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 114.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 116.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 118.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 120.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 122.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 124.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 126.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 128.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 130.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 132.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 134.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 136.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 138.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 140.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 142.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 144.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 146.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 148.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 150.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 152.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 154.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 156.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 158.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 160.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 162.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 164.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 166.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 168.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 170.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 172.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 174.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 176.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 178.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 180.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 182.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 184.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 186.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 188.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 190.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 192.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 194.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 196.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 198.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 200.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 202.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 204.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 206.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 208.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 210.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 212.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 214.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 216.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 218.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 220.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 222.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 224.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 226.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 228.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 230.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 232.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 234.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 236.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 238.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 240.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 242.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 244.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 246.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 248.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 250.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 252.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 254.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 256.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 258.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 260.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 262.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 264.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 266.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 268.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 270.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 272.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 274.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 276.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 278.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 280.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 282.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 284.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 286.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 288.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 290.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 292.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 294.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 296.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 298.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 300.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 302.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 304.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 306.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 308.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 310.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 312.00.

Two columns, changing monthly, 314.00.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

and yet deny that the Mason proviso, which reafirms and reestablishes, as part of a new compact, every provision of that third article preserves that principle. If the principle was preserved by one, it must be by the other.

I have now, I think, demonstrated that the Senator from Illinois was clearly wrong in regarding the intent of all the territory ceded from Texas into New Mexico, and just as clearly wrong in relation to the reaffirmance of the principle of the Missouri compromise by one of those very compromise acts, which he would have us say superseded it. Certainly the Senate, when it adopted the Mason proviso, without a division, and the House, when it agreed to the bill of which it was a part, must have intended to keep alive and affirm every provision of the third article of the annexation resolution. One of these provisions prohibited slavery north of 36° 30'. That provision preserved the principle of the Missouri compromise. The proviso, taken in connection with that provision, makes it clear beyond all question that the compromise acts preserved that principle, and enacted the consequence which it was intended to forestall.

I submit to the Senate if I have not completely vindicated this part of the appeal against the speech of the Senator? The errors, mistakes, misrepresentations, are all his own. None are found in the speech.

The third specification of the Senator charges the signers of the appeal with misrepresentation of the original policy of the country in respect to slavery. The Senator says:

"The argument of this manifesto was predicated upon the assumption that the policy of the fathers of the Republic was to prohibit slavery in all the Territories ceded by the old States to the Union, and made United States territory for the purpose of being organized into new States. I take issue upon that statement."

The Senator then proceeds to attempt to show that the original policy of the country was one of indifference between slavery and freedom; and that, in pursuance of it, a geographical line was established reaching from the east to the western limit of the original States—that is to say, to the Mississippi river. Sir, if anything is susceptible of absolute historical demonstration, I think it is the proposition that the founders of this Republic never contemplated any extension of slavery. Let us for a moment retrace the past.

What was the general sentiment of the country when the Declaration of Independence was first promulgated? Let me take Jefferson in the language of his memorable exposition of the rights of British America, laid before the Virginia convention, in August, 1774. These are his words:

"The abolition of domestic slavery is the greatest object of desire in these colonies, where it was unhappily introduced in their infant state."

In the spirit which animated Jefferson, the First Congress—the old Congress of 1774—among their first acts, entered into a solemn covenant against the slave trade.

In 1776, the Declaration of Independence, drafted by Jefferson, announced no such low and narrow principles as seem to be in fashion now. That immortal document asserted no right of the strong to oppress the weak, or to enslave the minority. It promulgated the sublime creed of human rights. It declared that ALL MEN are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights to life and liberty.

The first acquisition of territory was made by the United States three years before the adoption of the Constitution. Just after the country had emerged from the war of independence, when its struggles, perils, and principles, were fresh in remembrance, and the spirit of the Revolution yet lived and burned in every American heart, the First Congress, in its acquisition of territory, the acquisition was derived from—I might, perhaps, better say confirmed by—the cessions of Virginia, New York, and Connecticut. It was the territory north-west of the river Ohio.

Congress forthwith proceeded to consider the subject of its government. Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Howell, and Mr. Chase were appointed a committee to draft an ordinance making provision for that object. The ordinance reported was the work of Mr. Jefferson, and is marked throughout by his spirit of comprehensive intelligence, and devotion to liberty. It did not confine its regards to the territory actually acquired, but contemplated further acquisitions by the cession of other States. It provided for the admission of new States into the Union, State governments in all territory, whether "ceded or to be ceded," from the 31st parallel, the boundary between the United States and the Spanish provinces of Florida on the south, to the 42d parallel, the boundary between this country and the British possessions on the north.

The Territory was to be formed into States, the settlers were to receive authority from the General Government to form temporary governments. The temporary government was to continue in force until the population should increase to 20,000 inhabitants; and then the temporary were to be converted into permanent governments. Both the temporary and the permanent governments were to be established upon certain principles, expressly set forth in the ordinance, as their basis. Chief among those was the important proviso to which I now ask the attention of the Senate.

"After the year 1800 of the Christian era, there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted to have been personally guilty."

Let it be noted and remembered that this proviso applied not only to the territory which had been ceded already by Virginia and the other States, but to all territory ceded and to be ceded. There was not one inch of territory within the whole limits of the Republic which was not covered by the claims of one or another of the States. It was then the opinion of many statesmen—Mr. Jefferson himself among them—that the United States, under the Constitution, were incapable of acquiring territory outside of the original States. The Jefferson proviso, therefore, extended to all territory which it was then supposed the United States could possibly acquire.

Well, sir, what was the action upon this proviso? Mr. Jefferson and his colleagues moved that it be struck out from the ordinance. But the other six States—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and Pennsylvania; against the proviso three States—Virginia, Maryland, and South Carolina. Delaware and Georgia were not then represented in the Congress, and the vote of North Carolina being divided, not was it counted; nor was the vote of New Jersey counted, one delegate only being present. But the Senate will observe that the States stood six to three. Of the twenty-three delegates present, sixteen were for the proviso, and seven against it. The vote of the States was two to one, and that of the delegates more than two to one for the proviso.

But the provision of the Articles of Confederation, which gave a majority of all the States the power to interfere with the internal policy of any State, was retained and established by its own Constitution, and its application to the personal relations of the inhabitants. The States under the Constitution, are absolutely free from all interference by Congress in that respect, except, perhaps, in the case of war or insurrection; and may legislate where they please within the limitations of their own constitution. They may allow slavery if they please, just as they may license other things. But State laws, by which slavery is allowed and regulated, can operate only within the limits of the State, and can have no extra-territorial effect.

Sir, I could quote the opinions of southern judges ad infinitum, in support of the doctrine that slavery is against natural right, absolutely dependent for its existence or permanence upon State legislation. I might quote the doubtful selection by Randolph of Virginia, in his report of the Committee of Appeals—that slavery was so against justice that the presumption of freedom must be allowed in favor of every and any alleged slave suing for liberty, and that the onus of proving the contrary must rest upon the master.

I think, sir, I have shown that the ordinance of 1776, and the Constitution of the United States, are absolutely in harmony one with the other; and that the Constitution itself properly interpreted, and administered, would have excluded slavery in all newly-acquired territory. You see, whatever question can be entertained in regard to the interpretation of the Constitution which I defend, one thing is abundantly manifest, and that is that the

was the original policy of the country to exclude slavery from all national territory.

That policy was never departed from until the year 1799, when Congress accepted the cession, of what is now Tennessee from South Carolina. Nor did the acceptance of that cession indicate any purpose of establishing a geographical line between slavery and freedom? Why, sir, on the contrary, the free States on one side, the slave States on the other. The subject of it was, the whole territory west of the Mississippi, outside of the State of Louisiana; and the practical operation of it was, the division of this territory between the institution of slavery and the institution of freedom.

The arrangement was proposed by the slave States. It was carried by their votes. A large majority of southern Representatives voted for it; it was approved by all the southern members of the Cabinet, and received the sanction of the President. The compact was embodied in a single bill containing reciprocal provisions. The admission of Missouri with slavery, and the understanding that slavery should not be prohibited by Congress south of 36° 30', were the fundamental provisions of the proposed prohibition of that line. And that this prohibition was the consideration of the adoption, and the understanding. The slave States received a large share of the consideration coming to them, paid in hand. Missouri was admitted without restriction by the act itself. Every other part of the compact, on the part of the free States, has been fulfilled to the letter. No part of the compact on the part of the slave States has been fulfilled at all, except in the admission of Iowa, and the organization of Minnesota; and now the slave States propose to break up the contract without the consent and against the will of the free States, upon a doctrine of supersede which, if sanctioned at all, must be inevitably extended so as to overthrow the existing prohibition of slavery in all the organized Territories.

Let me read to the Senate some paragraphs from Niles' Register, published in Baltimore, March 21, 1820, which shows clearly what was then the universal understanding in respect to this arrangement:

"The territory north of 36° 30' is 'forever' forbidden to be peopled with slaves, except in the State of Missouri. The right then to inhibit slavery in any of the Territories is clearly and completely acknowledged, and it is conditioned as to some of the time that even when they become States, slavery shall be 'forever' prohibited in them."

"There is no hardship in this. The Territories belong to the United States, and the Government may rightfully prohibit the entry of which it will be safe to the public land. This great point was referred to the Senate, 23 votes to 11, and in the House of Representatives by 131 to 42, or really 130 to 57. And we trust that it is determined 'forever' in respect to the countries now subject to our organization."

"The language of Mr. Justice McLean on this point is very striking. He says:

"If it is true the compromise is supported only by the letter of the law, repeatable by the authority which enacted it; but the circumstances of the case give to this law a MOAL FORCE equal to that of a positive provision of the Constitution; and we do not hazard anything by saying that the Constitution exists in its obscure. Both parties have sacrificed much to accomplish this result."

"We wish to see the COMPACT kept in full force, and to trust that a kind Providence will open the way to relieve us of an evil which every good citizen deprecates as the supreme curse of this country."

"That, sir, was the language of a Marylander in 1820. He expressed the universal understanding of the country. Here then is a compact complete, perfect, irrepealable, so far as any compact can be said to be irrepealable, which is embodied in a legislative act. It had the two sections of the country for its parts, a great Territory for its subject, and a permanent adjustment of a dangerous controversy for its object. It was forced upon the free States. It has been literally fulfilled by the free States. It is binding, indeed, only upon honor and conscience; but, in such a matter, the obligations of honor and conscience must be regarded as even more sacred than those of constitutional provisions."

"Mr. President, if there was any principle which previously existed, it was that of prohibiting the continuance of slavery in the localities where it actually existed at the time of the acquisition of the Territory, and prohibiting it in the parts of Territory in which no slaves were actually held. This was a wise departure from the original policy which contemplated the exclusion of slaves from territories in which it actually existed at the time of acquisition. But the idea that slavery could ever be introduced into free territory, under the sanction of Congress, had not, as yet, entered into any man's head."

"Mr. HUNTER. I think that the provision passed without a division in the Senate."

"Mr. President. I shall hasten to a conclusion. In 1828 we acquired a vast territory from Mexico. The Free States demanded that this territory, when acquired, should remain free under the Government of the United States. The Senator from Illinois, with the proposal to extend the Missouri compromise line through this territory, and he complains that it was rejected by the votes of the free States. So it was. And why? Because the Missouri compromise had not, as yet, entered into any man's head."

"Mr. President. I shall hasten to a conclusion. The Missouri prohibition exempted a portion of this territory, and the larger portion, from the administration of Mr. Jefferson, the importation of slaves was prohibited into Mississippi and Louisiana north of 36° 30'. The House refused to concur in these amendments, and the Senate asked for a committee of conference, to which the House agreed. During the progress of these events, the House, after passing the Maine bill, had also passed a bill for the admission of Missouri, embodying the clause upon slaves as persons, and not as property."

"The history of that amendment is worth attention. The Senate from Virginia, who so ably represent on this floor one of those which immediately after the adoption of the Constitution, assumed the character of it, were unanimous in their opposition to it."

"No freeman ought to be taken, imprisoned or deprived of his freehold liberties, or franchises, or exiled, or exiled, or in any manner deprived of his life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

"Now, sir, in my judgment, this prohibition, as intended as a comprehensive guarantee of personal freedom, and denials absolute to Congress the power of legislating for the establishment or maintenance of slavery. This amendment of itself, rightly interpreted and applied, would be sufficient to prevent the introduction of slaves into any territory required by the United States. At all events, taken in connection with the ordinance, and with the original provision of the Constitution, it shows conclusively the absence of all intention upon the part of the founders of the Government to afford any countenance or protection to slavery outside of State limits. Departure from the true interpretation of the Constitution has created the necessity for positive prohibition."

"This was the condition of matters when the committee of conference, for which the Senate had asked, made their report. The members of the committee were, of course, favorable to the Senate amendment. The Speaker, HENRY CLAY, was also in favor of it, and he had the appointment of the committee. Of course he took care, as he has since informed the country, to constitute the committee in such manner, and of such persons as would be most likely to secure their adoption. The result was what might have been expected. It recommended that the Senate should rescind from its amendments to the Maine bill, and that the House should concur in the amendment to the Missouri bill.

"Mr. HUNTER. I think that the provision passed without a division in the Senate."

"Mr. CHASE. The Senator is mistaken. Fourteen Senators from the slave States, and twenty from the free States voted for that amendment. Eight from the former, and two from the latter voted against it. No voice by ayes and noes was taken when the same amendment was engrossed upon the separate Missouri bill, a few days later; the sense of the Senate having been ascertained by the former vote.

"This was the condition of matters when the committee of conference, for which the Senate had asked, made their report. The members of the committee were, of course, favorable to the Senate amendment. The Speaker, HENRY CLAY, was also in favor of it, and he had the appointment of the committee. Of course he took care, as he has since informed the country, to constitute the committee in such manner, and of such persons as would be most likely to secure their adoption. The result was what might have been expected. It recommended that the Senate should rescind from its amendments to the Maine bill, and that the House should concur in the amendment to the Missouri bill.

"Mr. HUNTER. I think that the provision passed without a division in the Senate."

"Mr. CHASE. The Senator is mistaken. Fourteen Senators from the slave States, and twenty from the free States voted for that amendment. Eight from the former, and two from the latter voted against it. No voice by ayes and noes was taken when the same amendment was engrossed upon the separate Missouri bill, a few days later; the sense of the Senate having been ascertained by the former vote.

"This was the condition of matters when the committee of conference, for which the Senate had asked, made their report. The members of the committee were, of course, favorable to the Senate amendment. The Speaker, HENRY CLAY, was also in favor of it, and he had the appointment of the committee. Of course he took care, as he has since informed the country, to constitute the committee in such manner, and of such persons as would be most likely to secure their adoption. The result was what might have been expected. It recommended that the Senate should rescind from its amendments to the Maine bill, and that the House should concur in the amendment to the Missouri bill.

"Mr. HUNTER. I think that the provision passed without a division in the Senate."

"Mr. CHASE. The Senator is mistaken. Fourteen Senators from the slave States, and twenty from the free States voted for that amendment. Eight from the former, and two from the latter voted against it. No voice by ayes and noes was taken when the same amendment was engrossed upon the separate Missouri bill, a few days later; the sense of the Senate having been ascertained by the former vote.

"This was the condition of matters when the committee of conference, for which the Senate had asked, made their report. The members of the committee were, of course, favorable to the Senate amendment. The Speaker, HENRY CLAY, was also in favor of it, and he had the appointment of the committee. Of course he took care, as he has since informed the country, to constitute the committee in such manner, and of such persons as would be most likely to secure their adoption. The result was what might have been expected. It recommended that the Senate should rescind from its amendments to the Maine bill, and that the House should concur in the amendment to the Missouri bill.

"Mr. HUNTER. I think that the provision passed without a division in the Senate."

"Mr. CHASE. The Senator is mistaken. Fourteen Senators from the slave States, and twenty from the free States voted for that amendment. Eight from the former, and two from the latter voted against it. No voice by ayes and noes was taken when the same amendment was engrossed upon the separate Missouri bill, a few days later; the sense of the Senate having been ascertained by the former vote.

"This was the condition of matters when the committee of conference, for which the Senate had asked, made their report. The members of the committee were, of course, favorable to the Senate amendment. The Speaker, HENRY CLAY, was also in favor of it, and he had the appointment of the committee. Of course he took care, as he has since informed the country, to constitute the committee in such manner, and of such persons as would be most likely to secure their adoption. The result was what might have been expected. It recommended that the Senate should rescind from its amendments to the Maine bill, and that the House should concur in the amendment to the Missouri bill.

"Mr. HUNTER. I think that the provision passed without a division in the Senate."

"Mr. CHASE. The Senator is mistaken. Fourteen Senators from the slave States, and twenty from the free States voted for that amendment. Eight from the former, and two from the latter voted against it. No voice by ayes and noes was taken when the same amendment was engrossed upon the separate Missouri bill, a few days later; the sense of the Senate having been ascertained by the former vote.

which it was contained was submitted by the President to his Cabinet, for their opinion on the constitutionality of that prohibition. CALIFORNIA, CRAWFORD, and WISE were members of that Cabinet. Each of a different opinion, affirmed its constitutionality, and the act received the sanction of the President. Thus we see that the parties to the arrangement were the two sections of the country—the free States on one side, the slave States on the other. The subject of it was, the whole territory west of the Mississippi, outside of the State of Louisiana; and the practical operation of it was, the division of this territory between the institution of slavery and the institution of freedom.

The arrangement was proposed by the slave States. It was carried by their votes. A large majority of southern Representatives voted for it; it was approved by all the southern members of the Cabinet, and received the sanction of the President.

which was never departed from until the year 1799, when Congress accepted the cession, of what is now Tennessee from South Carolina. Nor did the acceptance of that cession indicate any purpose of establishing a geographical line between slavery and freedom? Why, sir, on the contrary, the free States on one side, the slave States on the other. The subject of it was, the whole territory west of the Mississippi, outside of the State of Louisiana; and the practical operation of it was, the division of this territory between the institution of slavery and the institution of freedom.

The arrangement was proposed by the slave States. It was carried by their votes. A large majority of southern Representatives voted for it; it was approved by all the southern members of the Cabinet, and received the sanction of the President.

which was never departed from until the year 1799, when Congress accepted the cession, of what is now Tennessee from South Carolina. Nor did the acceptance of that cession indicate any purpose of establishing a geographical line between slavery and freedom? Why, sir, on the contrary, the free States on one side, the slave States on the other. The subject of it was, the whole territory west of the Mississippi, outside of the State of Louisiana; and the practical operation of it was, the division of this territory between the institution of slavery and the institution of freedom.

The arrangement was proposed by the slave States. It was carried by their votes. A large majority of southern Representatives voted for it; it was approved by all the southern members of the Cabinet, and received the sanction of the President.

which was never departed from until the year 1799, when Congress accepted the cession, of what is now Tennessee from South Carolina. Nor did the acceptance of that cession indicate any purpose of establishing a geographical line between slavery and freedom? Why, sir, on the contrary, the free States on one side, the slave States on the other. The subject of it was, the whole territory west of the Mississippi, outside of the State of Louisiana; and the practical operation of it was, the division of this territory between the institution of slavery and the institution of freedom.

The arrangement was proposed by the slave States. It was carried by their votes. A large majority of southern Representatives voted for it; it was approved by all the southern members of the Cabinet, and received the sanction of the President.

which was never departed from until the year 1799, when Congress accepted the cession, of what is now Tennessee from South Carolina. Nor did the acceptance of that cession indicate any purpose of establishing a geographical line between slavery and freedom? Why, sir, on the contrary, the free States on one side, the slave States on the other. The subject of it was, the whole territory west of the Mississippi, outside of the State of Louisiana; and the practical operation of it was, the division of this territory between the institution of slavery and the institution of freedom.

The arrangement was proposed by the slave States. It was carried by their votes. A large majority of southern Representatives voted for it; it was approved by all the southern members of the Cabinet, and received the sanction of the President.

which was never departed from until the year 1799, when Congress accepted the cession, of what is now Tennessee from South Carolina. Nor did the acceptance of that cession indicate any purpose of establishing a geographical line between slavery and freedom? Why, sir, on the contrary, the free States on one side, the slave States on the other. The subject of it was, the whole territory west of the Mississippi, outside of the State of Louisiana; and the practical operation of it was, the division of this territory between the institution of slavery and the institution of freedom.

The arrangement was proposed by the slave States. It was carried by their votes. A large majority of southern Representatives voted for it; it was approved by all the southern members of the Cabinet, and received the sanction of the President.

which was never departed from until the year 1799, when Congress accepted the cession, of what is now Tennessee from South Carolina. Nor did the acceptance of that cession indicate any purpose of establishing a geographical line between slavery and freedom? Why, sir, on the contrary, the free States on one side, the slave States on the other. The subject of it was, the whole territory west of the Mississippi, outside of the State of Louisiana; and the practical operation of it was, the division of this territory between the institution of slavery and the institution of freedom.

The arrangement was proposed by the slave States. It was carried by their votes. A large majority of southern Representatives voted for it; it was approved by all the southern members of the Cabinet, and received the sanction of the President.

which was never departed from until

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE:

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

Salem, Ohio, February 18, 1854.

Mr. CHASE'S SPEECH.—We have thought it best to give the whole speech at once. It spreads out the whole question. With it and the address from Messrs. Giddings, Chase and others, which we have previously published, and a good map of North America, any one who takes an interest in the question, can give the facts to his whole neighborhood. Will not some body in every school district, undertake it? It is a stupendous inquiry which is contemplated, and no one should be indifferent or inactive.

We have no room for comments in reference to the meetings which were held here last week. They were in some respects quite peculiar, but were also interesting.

PARKER PILLSBURY.—Many hearts will rejoice to learn of the safe arrival of Mr. Pillsbury in England. We are happy to state that they will have the privilege of hearing from him frequently during his absence.

Ill health has prevented our usual attention to the paper this week. Several notices and communications next week.

MR. FOSTER'S COMMUNICATION on our last page, was received without explanation. We suppose however from the circumstances of the case, that it had been declined by the Michigan Free Democratic.

(For the Anti-Slavery Bugle.)

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

ON BOARD STEAMSHIP AMERICA, Lat. 51° 40' north, Long. W. 31° 25'. January 13, 1854.

DEAR FRIEND MARCUS: Except to make a few brief entries in my memorandum, I am doing my first writing since losing sight of land, to day. My first letter was to my loved ones at home. My second is to you and the readers of the Bugle. None surely have higher claims, to gratify, no others could give me higher pleasure. At sunset I look often to the west and say, this side of that golden scene is New England, and beyond New England is Ohio, with those adjoining states, where lie those I most love on earth, or [of created beings] any where else—and that gilded sunset scene is just the frame with which I would surround such a picture.

And so I gaze at my gorgeous vision. You will know, dear Marcus, whether you love your friends, when three thousand miles of watery wilderness shall separate you from them. And then too, my awful sea sickness shall have seized and bound you down day after day, until you scarcely care how soon the frail plank that partitions you from eternity shall split asunder. You will then know whether a smile, a kind look, a cheering word, or soft soothing hand of some cherished spirit, would impart bliss or not to your saddened soul; your suffering body. But to-day, the terrors and torments of sea sickness are past, and triumphantly I tread old ocean under my feet. Thus is one victory after another secured only by patient endurance.

So far, my voyage has been attended with less scenes of excitement than could have been expected. We have had many squalls of hail and snow, indeed no day has been without them. But a severe gale has not crossed our path. No "billows mountain high," have come near us. Scarcey has a wave broken on to our decks at all—never to any body's inconvenience. The action of our ship has not been roaring and pitching like an untaught colt, but rolling from side to side like a log. I should have liked the other motion better. Some days the rolling has been so violent, as that every dish on the table, and every candle had to be confined, and tables and settees of course, screwed fast to the floor. And then you had to watch well your tea and coffee cups, your gravies and saucers; or they would all be leaping into your lap, as familiarly as a family of playful kittens.

But the sublime grandeur of the ocean itself, is a theme for contemplation, though not for description. None who appreciate it will dare attempt to unseal its mysteries. To me Columbus has become a real, not a fabled Neptune, and I contemplate him as indeed almost a god. To plough the pathless surface even now, in wintry storm and tempest, in dark as well as day, is work for heroic men. But what was it when that rash adventurer dared defy its then unknown perils, and felt his doubtful way over thousand after thousand of unmeasured miles, with men more mutinous than the waves, in search of another world, in the existence of which, none but he had even faith—much less knowledge or description. Before, it had ruled undisturbed, its awful empire, as its billows and the ages rolled on together. Such deed of daring, it had never frowned upon till then, at least for unknown generations. Surely it ought to have surprised us at discretion, as it did. No wonder it bore the conquering hero to the boon he sought. In him, sublime greatness met its equal, and more than equal, and finally it yielded the sceptre. The riddle of the Sphinx was solved, and its mysterious power was surrendered forever.

I have lived the ocean long and well. Many have asked me on your side of the Alleghenies, why I would not remain in the West. My answer has ever been, I am a child of the sea, and long to be near my mother. But she has rather step-mothered it over me on this my first fondling, with her ever heaving bosom. And I have almost vowed revenge upon her at times, and determined to hide out of her sight in the deepest valley of the west. But to-day with a sunshine and calm, like a New England May, she is rocking me so gently, and I feel so well, and strong, and vigorous, that she has convinced and conquered me. And she makes me believe fully, that I am indeed better for what I have suffered—that her medicines, though harsh to take, are yet most efficacious; and she after all, the Queen of this grand system of Hydropathy.

This is my first letter to the Bugle, on my Foreign Tour. I dare not promise you many, but on the other hand, England is not rich enough to buy out the pleasure my connexion with my western friends through its colonies, gives me. From Jefferson to Salem and thence to New Richmond on the Ohio, in western Pennsylvania, Michigan and Indiana, there are those all along in whose friendship is now my felicity, in whose society and affection, I trust will be my heaven forever.

An ocean may separate, but it cannot sunder us. Distance may stretch its domain never so widely, it shall only swell higher the tide of affection.—Time may mould and move over institutions and monumental mounds, but over the inexpressible treasures of the heart, neither time, nor distance, nor the wildest oceans, have dominion or control, God meant and made it so to be. All true and loving spirits he unites; and what God has joined,

together, no power in the universe less than his own, can ever put asunder.

Yours, dear Marcus, and all your Readers,
PARKER PILLSBURY.

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

Pursuant to a call for an Anti-Slavery Convention, published in the Anti-Slavery Bugle and other papers, to be held at the Union House, in Linton, Wayne Co., Michigan, on Saturday and Sunday, the 4th and 5th of February, the Convention convened, and organized by appointing the following officers:

President—CYRUS FULLER, of Plymouth.

Vice Presidents.

HARriet D. G. FULLER, of Plymouth, John Briggs, of Farmington, Adolphus Brigham, of Mead's Mills.

Secretaries.

CYNTHIA WAXTON, of Farmington, Richard Glazier, Jr., of Ann Arbor, Business Committee.

James W. Walker, Abby Kelly Foster, Edwin Fuller, Plymouth, Mr. Holden, Plymouth, Mr. Packard, Plymouth, Warren Gilbert, Wolf Creek, Benjamin S. Jones, Thomas Chandler, Adrian, Finance Committee.

Emeline De Garmo, Ypsilanti, Lucenia A. Fuller, Plymouth, Ann Hayball, Adrian, Jacob Walton, Adrian.

The Chairman of the Business Committee reported resolutions 1st and 2nd, which were discussed at length by James W. Walker, Stephen S. Foster, and Dennis Washington. On motion, the Convention then took a recess of 30 minutes.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Discussion of the 2nd resolution continued, in which Abby K. Foster, J. W. Walker, S. S. Foster and B. S. Jones participated.

EVENING SESSION.

S. S. Foster reported resolutions 2nd and 3rd as adopted, and urged the formation of Societies in every town where two or three could be found willing to meet together and unite their efforts for the overthrow of Slavery. On motion, the Convention adjourned to meet at 10 o'clock the following morning.

SECOND DAY.

Convention opened with singing an anti-slavery song. J. W. Walker, in a speech of thrilling interest, demonstrated the anti-slavery movement to be the only Christian movement of the day, and consequently claiming the sympathies and co-operation of every Christian. B. S. Jones followed, and in a most conclusive and forcible manner showed up the profligacy of Church and State.

S. S. Foster opened the subject of finance, and made a most affecting appeal in behalf of his enslaved brother. Mrs. Foster followed. Her remarks told upon the pockets as well as upon the hearts of the audience.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Free Soil party, and the organ of that party, the Free Democrat, coming up for consideration, their position was thoroughly discussed by S. S. Foster, Thomas Scott, Mr. Murry, and others.

EVENING SESSION.

B. S. Jones and J. W. Walker argued the superiority of moral and political action, not only in point of principle, but as a matter of expediency. S. S. Foster, in a concluding and powerful speech, demonstrated from the very "nature of things, the organization of an anti-slavery political party must of necessity prove a failure. The Finance Committee collected the sum of \$575. The resolutions were then taken up separately, and adopted as follows:

Resolved. That we reiterate most solemnly the sentiment which from the beginning has been the rallying cry of abolitionists, that slavery is a sin, and the highest crime against man, and shall so declare unto all Godly Christians of its wrong, and demonstrate its sinfulness by undoing the heavy burdens and setting the oppressed free.

Resolved. That this Convention deeply feels the necessity of a thorough organization of the anti-slavery cause in this State, on the basis of the American Anti-Slavery Society, by which it shall be taken from the arena of politics, and the control of demagogues and political aspirants, and placed in the hands of enlightened philanthropists, who have no object to promote but the highest good of our common country, and are under no temptation to pervert it to party or sectarian purposes.

Resolved. That we heartily rejoice in the auspicious commencement of this work in the recent organization of a State Anti-Slavery Society, and sincerely hope it will go on until there shall be an efficient auxiliary association in every county and town in the State, and we here pledge to the State Society our warmest sympathies and cordial co-operation in its holy work of renovating the public sentiment of the community, so that slavery can find no support, either in the political or the religious history of the country.

Resolved. That we have no controversy with Churches, as such, but oppose them only so far as they sustain slavery—as abolitionists it matters not to us whether ecclesiastical organizations be catholic or protestant, whether they hold to the doctrine of the trinity or unity, whether they practice baptism by immersion or by sprinkling, worship in silence or with hymns of praise and songs of thanksgiving, if they are true to humanity, faithful in advocating the cause of the slave, they will meet with no opposition from the anti-slavery platform.

Resolved. That no church organization can occupy a true and worthy position, which retains its members in a state of slavery, and who defend or apologize for the system, who are members of a government that sustains slavery, or the supporters of a party which sanctions or tolerates it.

Resolved. That although there is a difference in the amount of popular influence given by different ecclesiastical organizations, we know of but one religious denomination which we regard as entirely free from slavery; and it always affords us pleasure to make mention of the anti-slavery character and consistent position of the Old School covenanters.

Resolved. That while we recognize in the Free Soil party many sincere and earnest friends of the slave, we cannot regard the party itself as in any sense entitled to our confidence and support, as an anti-slavery agency, but on the contrary, we believe it to be not only radically defective in principle, but in policy utterly at variance with the principles of the anti-slavery enterprise, and it always affords us pleasure to make mention of the strong influence in its behalf here.

Yours as ever, W.

columns of the paper through which they have been assailed and maligned. Therefore,

Resolved. That the Free Democrat, while claiming to be especially a friend of the slave, is doing an eminently pro-slavery work in misrepresenting and defaming some of the true friends of freedom, that its denial of the right of defense in its columns proves the despotism of its conductors, that its cowardly, partial policy disqualifies it from being the recognized organ of any party which claims to be the advocates of "free men, free thought, and free speech."

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

Resolved. That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they became acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors, and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial, truthful and decent publication.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

Salem, Ohio, February 18, 1854.

LETTER FROM STEPHEN S. FOSTER.

To the Editor of the Michigan Free Democrat:

A friend of mine has called my attention to an editorial article in your paper of the 13th ult., which is calculated to mislead many honest enquirers after truth; and as you have intimated that your columns are open to a reply, I send you the following for insertion in your weekly issue. The article to which I refer is headed, "Mrs. Foster and the Free Democracy." It is of great length, and is made up, in the main, of a tissue of accusations, impeaching her integrity as an advocate of the anti-slavery cause, and was evidently designed to prejudice the public mind, and preclude her from an impartial hearing. Of the spirit of these accusations I do not purpose to speak, at length, but shall confine myself, mainly, to the accusations themselves, and the circumstances of their allegation; leaving others to judge of the motives which prompted them.

The article opens with a notice, in deprecatory terms, of a letter from Mrs. Foster which appeared in the Anti-Slavery Bugle, an extract from which you copy; and after some rather general complaints of her course, you go on to say, "She and her husband came here with war declared, in their hearts, against the Free Democratic party and its organ."

This statement of our position, purposes, and feelings towards the Free Democratic party and its organ, is essentially and radically false. It is true that we have always regarded the party as occupying an unsound position, and as wasting its energies in a fruitless struggle for political power, while the heart of the people is yet wedded to slavery. But we supposed that most of its members were true at heart, and that they would welcome us to their State, as we had been welcomed by many of the same party in other sections of the country, to discuss, in an amiable spirit, the grounds of difference between us, and to a united effort against slavery, on all the many points on which we are agreed; and we anticipated nothing but the most hearty co-operation from the mass of those who compose the Free Democracy, as your readers would already have seen, had you published the whole of Mrs. Foster's letter, instead of an extract, which gives a false impression. We went to Detroit, as we go elsewhere, for the purpose of meeting the friends of freedom, of all parties, in open, manly discussion, to devise ways and means for the overthrow of this giant evil. This was our only purpose. We had no party to build up; no sect to sustain; and we opposed none, except such as were giving their sanction and support to slavery.—

Against such, and such only, did we war, as you very well know, if you were present at our meetings. And our warfare was of that open, manly character which Christianity requires. We did not spring upon our enemies from ambush; nor did we first bind them fast, and then thrust them through with the murderous steel. On the contrary, all our meetings were entirely free, and all persons, of whatever shade of opinion, were cordially invited to participate in the discussion of any and every subject which was brought before them.

The ground we assumed at these meetings was, that slavery, under all circumstances, is sinful; and, hence, it is morally wrong to do anything, knowingly, which sustains it. We represented the Free Soil party as practically involved in the responsibility of sustaining it, in that they support the United States Constitution which, according to their own interpretation, requires the suppression of a slave insurrection; the rendition of fugitive slaves; and the protection of slave states against invasion, even though the invasion should be for the sole purpose of giving liberty to the slaves. And we insisted that the party should either put an anti-slavery construction on the Constitution as does Gerrit Smith, and not against slavery, with some appearance of consistency under it; or, with Garrison, repudiate it altogether, and, taking their stand outside of the existing National Government, demand its dissolution, and the organization of one which shall protect alike the liberty of all its subjects. We also took exception to the policy of the party in voting for the candidates of the other parties for the sake of getting support from them in return. Now, is there anything in this of which any honorable man can complain? Is it making war upon the Free Democratic party, to give the public a correct representation of its position? You, surely, will not complain that the party was misrepresented. Or, if it was, whose fault was it? We represented it precisely as we understood it; and we then called on its friends to make the correction, if, in their opinion, any injustice had been done it. But, in connexion with our objections to the party, we also represented it as occupying less objectionable ground than that of the Whig and Democratic parties; and as made up, in the main, of the better portion of the politicians. Most of the party are really interested in the abolition of slavery, and, hence, there are very few sections of the country where we are not welcomed by its friends and supporters. Detroit is an exception to a general rule, and presents a striking contrast to the city of Worcester, the place of our residence. In that city, last winter, Mrs. Foster collected of the Free Democracy, Two Hundred Dollars, for the use of our Society. Twenty Dollars of which were paid by the Free Soil member of Congress; and this is, probably, not more than they have been in the practice of contributing annually, for several years past. In Ohio, too, notwithstanding your declaration to the contrary, we have always received a cordial welcome from the leaders of the party, some of whom are among the most liberal contributors to our treasury. And even in this State I am confident we should have met with no opposition from the party, had it not been under the control of a little knot of persons, who have "stolen the livery of the court of Heaven to serve the devil in." This opposition to us is evidently the fruit of religious bigotry, and not of interest in the anti-slavery cause, the success of the party. Indeed, the authors of it have shown themselves ready to sacrifice not only the cause of the slave, but even the party itself, to the gratification of their sectarian malice.

As regards the organ of the party, I need only say, we have never had any opposition to it, except on the ground of its misrepresentation of ourselves and our associates. Had it kept to its own appropriate work of advocating the claims of the party, and not turned aside to misrepresent and traduce the friends and agents of the Anti-Slavery Society; and, especially, had its columns been open to free discussion, we should have had no controversy with it; but on the contrary, should have hailed it as an auxiliary, and paved the way for it to obtain a wider circulation. We never had a wish to circumscribe its influence, till convinced of its purpose to hedge up our way, by resorting to the low and despotic policy of Bennett's Herald, and the New York Observer. But so long as it shall continue its present course, duty to the slave will re-

quire us to oppose it by every honorable means in our power.

You complain that Mrs. Foster "came to a city where there was a well established anti-slavery organization, and commenced her lectures without the slightest intimation to that organization, dispensing with all the common courtesies of such occasions; and instead of cultivating a friendly feeling, commenced an indiscriminating onslaught upon all anti-slavery churches, (particularly the Wesleyan Methodists,) all anti-slavery organizations, except those for which she was soliciting subscribers." And you then ask, as if confident of a negative answer, "Was this like the conduct of Miss Sallie Holly, when, just before, she visited our city?"

This complaint of want of courtesy on the part of Mrs. Foster, is a mere ruse. It is without the least ground whatever; and, moreover, what is worse it contains several statements which are *baseless fabrications*, and which prove their author hardly pushed to make out a case. The fact is, Mrs. Foster and her very intimate friend, Miss Holley, pursued precisely the same course, so far as this matter is concerned. Both visited Detroit by invitation of prominent individuals in the Free Soil party. The meetings of both were got up by the respective gentlemen from whom they had received the invitation. Both accepted such entertainment while in the city, as was provided by the gentleman who invited them; and a very pleasant home was that to which Mrs. Foster was invited. Neither of them gave the "slightest intimation" to any "well organized anti-slavery organization," of their intention to lecture in the city, except by a general notice; and neither of them, I presume, knew, or had even heard of the existence of such an organization. Neither of them made any call except by special invitation, while Miss Holley as well as Mrs. Foster, was, I dare say, far more forgetful of what was due to courtesy, as to "fail to advise either the Committee or the editors of her coming," except the one from whom she received her invitation.

You complain that neither "she nor her husband called on us," [you]. True, but whose fault was it? Surely not ours. We should gladly have accepted an invitation from you, had it been extended to us. You knew of our arrival in the city, and me on the first day of our meetings, but expressed no wish to receive a call from us. But I did call twice at your office, for the purpose of an interview with you relative to our operations in the city and state, but was told that you were absent. My first call was prior to our meetings. From your treatment of Miss Holley we took you to be an abolitionist, and not a mere partisan politician, or sectarian bigot; and, hence, we hoped to secure your co-operation in the work of converting the State to anti-slavery, without regard to the effect it might have on your particular party, or sect. But in this, I am sorry to say, we have been sadly disappointed.

You add, in connection with this complaint, "We did not attend her first meetings,"—and intimate that you acted in this matter, only in compliance with the earnest solicitations of "leading members of the party and of the State Committee." Surely, you cannot have forgotten that you were present at our first meeting—that you introduced yourself to us—and that, in our presence, you took no exceptions whatever, either publicly or in private, to any thing we had said or done. As to the truth of what you say about having acted under the advice of the State Committee, I have no means of judging. Knowing, however, that no confidence can be placed in what you say of us, it is safe to conclude that you may have equally misrepresented them. If they are honorable men, you must have done them, as well as us, great injustice. But, if it be true that they have counselled your course, it should be publicly made known, on competent authority, that they may share with you the responsibility.

Hereto, as I am credibly informed, you have *privately* disclaimed the course and vulgar assault made upon Mrs. Foster, by your former associate, Mr. Fox, and have repeatedly said that had you seen his article in reference to her before its publication, you would have excluded it from your columns. His name was struck from the imprint of your paper, and you have assigned his removal from the editorial chair, as evidence of your disapproval of his course, and as a reason why you should not be held responsible for it. But now, it seems, you are ready, formally, to endorse it, and declare his "structures strictly true and perfectly just." But why, if you approve of his course, do you so often disclaim it in private? And why do you now withhold his article from your country subscribers? I call for its publication in your weekly issue.

The reason you assign for this attack, namely, that it was required to "disabuse our community of the injurious impression which was diligently sought to be made on the public mind, that Mrs. Foster's views were identical with the Free Democratic platform," is a mere *sham*. If your own testimony is at all reliable, no one could possibly mistake her position. You tell us that your "Ears were besieged with reports of how she had assisted the Free Democratic party," and yet it was necessary for the organ of the party to play the blackguard towards her to convince the public that she was not identified with it! Such nonsense may pass current among the "leading members of the party and the State Committee," but among the masses it will find no one ignorant enough to be deceived by it.

But this article was "Published only in the daily edition." And why? You say, "Because the purpose it was designed to accomplish was confined to the city, and we had no desire to prejudice anti-slavery people against Mrs. F." Why was it pre-judiced then against her? If she be the "dishonest," "mendacious," "perfidious," "treacherous" creature you represent her to be, was it not your duty, as a public journalist, and especially as the mouthpiece of an anti-slavery party, to expose her character to the world, and thus save the ignorant and unsuspecting from being made her prey? Does Detroit need light in regard to this "wicked foolish woman" more than other sections of the State? If a hundredth part of what you say of her be true, you have been false to your trust, if any honorable means in your power has been left unemployed in circumscribing her influence. But why this hypocrisy? Why not own at once what every lady acquainted with the matter believes to be the fact, that you did not publish the article in your weekly issue, simply, because you feared its effect in your paper?

Your notes on Mrs. Foster's letter contain much that is untrue, but to most of it a reply will be found in what I have already said. There are a few things, however, which require further notice. Mrs. F. states in the letter referred to, that "The Democrat published a set of garbled resolutions, stating that they were the resolutions of the meeting"—referring to a meeting of the colored people of Detroit. Your note in this statement is what

its numbers and years; while, at the same time we have endeavored to rescue its name from the foul dishonor which has been cast upon it by the traffickers in God's image, and their northern abettors, and apologists, who, with brazen effrontery, claim to be the followers of Jesus. I will not say that you know us to be the advocates and devotees of the christian faith; but I do say, that, if you do not know it, it must be because you have never known what that faith is. And yet you have poisoned the public mind with the impression that we are the enemies of christianity. Verily, you have a zeal for your religious faith, but it is the same bold and persecuting spirit that nailed Jesus to the cross.

But notwithstanding you know us to be the vile persons which you have here represented—enemies alike to God and man—you still desire to extend to us "Nothing but friendly encouragement." At least, this is what you have, in substance, to your readers that you published the following note:

"MORE AGITATION."

"Mrs. Abby Kelly Foster, and Stephen S. Foster, the distinguished anti-slavery champions, will address the citizens of Detroit, in the City Hall, on next Sunday afternoon, the 9th inst., on the subject of human slavery. It is enough to say that they are two of the ablest and most interesting anti-slavery speakers, to secure the attendance of all who are interested in the great question of human liberty, to give them a hearing."

Your readers are given to understand that the publication of this notice was your act, and you ask that it may be set down to your credit, and received as evidence that Mrs. Foster was the aggressor in this controversy. Be it so, then.—Where does this assumption place you as an abolitionist, and a man of honor? According to your own statement of the matter, this commendation of us was false and hypocritical. It was a fraud upon the public, as it was evidently designed to draw them out, by a false gloss, to listen to speakers, whose aim it was, as you affirm, "to strike down, with perfidious dagger, pretty much every prominent abolitionist in the land." Comment on such conduct is unnecessary.

There is however a tale about the "utmost kindness and the largest liberality," of this inquiry, which is not yet told, and one, which is essential to a full understanding of your course and character. It is this. With the publication of this notice, I understand, you had nothing whatever to do. It was inserted in your absence, by Mr. Bibb, and he was told by the then acting editor, your late associate, Mr. Fox, that had he seen it, before the paper went to press, he should have refused its publication. It was to the *honest and hearty* co-operation of Mr. and Mrs. Bibb alone, that we were indebted for the very interesting meetings that we held in your city, and not to the good will of the organ of the Free Democracy.

How are we to understand you, when you say, "We did not attend her first meetings,"—and intimate that you acted in this matter, only in compliance with the earnest solicitations of "leading members of the party and of the State Committee"? Surely, you cannot have forgotten that you were present at our first meeting—that you introduced yourself to us—and that, in our presence, you took no exceptions whatever, either publicly or in private, to any thing we had said or done. As to the truth of what you say about having acted under the advice of the State Committee, I have no means of judging. Knowing, however, that no confidence can be placed in what you say of us, it is safe to conclude that you may have equally misrepresented them. If they are honorable men, you must have done them, as well as us, great injustice.

But, if it be true that they have counseled your course, it should be publicly made known, on competent authority, that they may share with you the responsibility. APPENDIX. DR. GEO. W. P. PETTIT.

From the Evening Post.
THE OLD CHIMNEY-PLACE.

A stack of stones, a dingy wall,
O'er which the brambles cling and creep,
A path on which no shadows fall,
A door-step where long dock-leaves sleep,
A broken rafter in the grass,
A sunken hearth-stone, stained and cold,
Naught left but these, fair home, alas!
And the bare memories of old.

Around this hearth, this sacred place,
All humble household virtues grew,—
The grand'sire's love, the maiden's grace,
The matron's instinct deep and true.
Here first sweet words were lisped; here broke
Life's morning dream, and yet more dear,
The love that life's best impulse woke,
Grew warmer, gentler, year by year.

How cheerful, while the storm without
Muffled the earth and veiled the night,
The ruddy glow gushed laughing out
On merry groups and faces bright;
How clinged the crackling, freakish ease
With rosy mirth or thoughtful ease,
Or, may be, syllabled the name
Of one rocked o'er the shivering seas.

What fairy scenes, what golden lands,
What pageants of romantic pride,
In the weird deep of glowing braids,
Save the fair boy, the dreamy-eyed,
Till musing here, his spirit drew
Strong inspiration, and his years,
By beauty's subtle nurture, knew
The paths of Nature's inner spheres.

Here as the swooning embers sent
A faint flush through the quiet gloom,
In the warm hush have lovers blent
The fragrance of their heart's fresh bloom;
And, veiling in soft-drooping eyes
Her tremulous joy, here blushed the bride;

Here the o' pale forms in funeral guest,
Farewells from broken hearts were sighed.

This spot the pilgrim, 'neath strange skies,
Saw in his wistful dream; here stood
Old friends with gladness in their eyes;

Here grew the beautiful and good—
Sweet friendships—faith serene and sure—

Manhood's strong purpose, warm and bold—
Courage to labor and endure,
And household feelings never cold.

Here, leaning in the twilight dim,
All round me seems a haunted air;
I hear the old familiar hymn,

My heart goes upwards in the prayer

That made the right so full of peace;

Kind lips are on my brow—my ear

Hums with sweet sounds—they faint—they cease,

And nigh o'er all broods calm and clear.

H. N. POWERS.

On the 1st of January, the population of the State of California was estimated at 310,000, and composed of 215,000 Americans, 25,000 Germans, 25,000 French, 17,000 Chinamen, 20,000 Spanish blood, 5,000 miscellaneous foreigners, 20,000 Indians, and 25,000 Negroes. Of these, about 65,000 are women, and perhaps 30,000 children.

Yours etc., H. N. POWERS.

Bryant & Lusk and Stratton's Merchantile College.

SUPERIOR STREET, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Principals.

H. B. BRYANT, JAS. WASHINGTON LUSK,
& H. DWIGHT STRATTON.

Faculty.

H. B. BRYANT, Professor of the Science of Accounts.

J. WASHINGTON LUSK, Prof. of the Spencerian System of Penmanship.

DWIGHT STRATTON, Associate Prof. in the several Departments.

W. W. HARDER, Assistant Prof. in the Book-Keeping Department.

HON. JUDGE STARKWEATHER and H. D. CLARK, Lecturers on Commercial Law.

PROF. ASA MAHAN, Lecturer on Political Economy.

EMERSON E. WHITE, Lecturer on Commercial Geography.

TERRIBLE.

For full course in Double Entry Book-keeping, and other Departments, time unlimited, \$40.00

For full course in Ladies Department, - - - 30.00

For separate course in Practical Penmanship, 5.00

For various styles in Ornamental Writing—as agreed upon.

The Principals of this Institution, design making it one of the best mediums in the United States for imparting a thorough practical knowledge of the various duties of the Counting Room and business pursuits in general.

THE COURSE OF INSTRUCTION, embraces

Book-keeping by Double Entry, as applied to the various departments of Trade, Commerce, and Manufactures, comprehending the best forms now used by the most flourishing and eminent establishments, engaged individually or in partnership, at Wholesale and Retail, on Commission or Joint Speculation, including Banking, Steamboating, Insurance, Railroad and Joint Stock Books, &c., Commercial Calculations and Correspondence, embracing every variety of business computation, and familiarizing the student with the Commercial Technicalities and Phrasology of Correspondence.

COMMERCIAL GEOGRAPHY is a new feature in Mercantile Schools, and having its origin as in this Institution, much will be done to make it an instructive and profitable branch in the Lecture Department.

The Spencerian System of Practical Penmanship in all its forms, will be taught by its Author, P. R. Spencer, and J. W. Lusk. No Institution in America offers superior facilities to us for imparting a Rapid and Systematic Hand Writing. Gentlemen and ladies in all parts of the country, desirous of qualifying themselves for Teachers of this unrivaled and popular System, will find their wants met at this College.

THE LADIES' DEPARTMENT is entirely

separated, and is fitted up in a spacious and convenient style.

Many Ladies, that are not

acquainted with the Spencerian System, have

been greatly pleased with the results.

THE STUDENTS' DEPARTMENT is entirely

</div